REMARKS

The Final Office Action, mailed April 23, 2008, considered claims 1–9 and 23–40. Claims 1–9 and 23–40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krein et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,385,701 (filed Nov. 19, 1999) (hereinafter Krein), in view of Seejo Sebastine, *A Scalable Content Distribution Service for Dynamic Web Content* (University of Virginia, June 15, 2001) (hereinafter Sebastine), and further in view of Wallach et al., *Extensible Security Architectures for Java* (December 1997) (hereinafter Wallach).[1]

By this response, claims 23–26 are amended and claims 1–9 and 37–40 have been cancelled. Claims 23–36 remain pending.[2] Claims 23 and 36 are independent claims which remain at issue. Support for the amendments may be found within Specification ¶¶ 0042–0058 and Fig's 3–6.[3]

As reflected in the claims, the present invention is directed generally toward methods and computer program products for relocating and reorganizing legacy storage and for accessing the relocated storage. Claim 23 recites, for instance, in combination with all the elements of the claim, a method for reorganizing storage and accessing the reorganized storage. The method includes, inter alia, relocating a share from a legacy server to a new server. The contents and permissions of the legacy share are copied to the new server. The legacy server name is aliased to a consolidation server. A root associated with the legacy share is created on the consolidation server and a link is created on the legacy server root corresponding to the share on the new server. The legacy server name is resolved and the consolidation server receives a request from a client for the legacy share. The consolidation server rewrites the legacy share path name and traverses the rewritten share path name and resolves links within the path. The consolidation server responds to the request with the share path name of the (new) location of the relocated legacy share.

---

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

[2] The amendments and remarks presented herein are consistent with the information presented by telephone by patent attorney John Bacoch (reg. no. 59,890) and attorney Thomas Bonacci.

[3] Note that the paragraph numbers are taken from the published application, U.S. Pat. Pub. 20040243646 (Dec. 2, 2004). It should also be noted that the present invention and claims as recited take support from the entire Specification. As such, no particular part of the Specification should be considered separately from the entirety of the Specification.

Claim 36 recites a computer program product embodiment of the method of claim 23.

Each of the pending independent claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Krein, in view of Sebastine, and in view of Wallach. The independent claims have now been amended and the Applicants submit that the prior art fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of the claims as now presented herein.

Krein discloses methods and systems for sharing data between clients using token management. *See* Krein, Abstract. Sebastine discloses a scalable content distribution service for dynamic web content. *See* Sebastine, Introduction. Wallach discloses extensible security architectures for Java. *See* Wallach, Abstract and Introduction. However, the prior art fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of the independent claims as now presented.

In particular, the prior art fails to teach or suggest relocating a legacy share from a legacy server to a new server. The prior art also fails to teach or suggest copying contents and permissions of the legacy share to the new server. The prior art also fails to teach or suggest aliasing the legacy server name to resolve to the network address of a consolidation server. The prior art also fails to teach or suggest creating a legacy server root associated with the name of the legacy server on the consolidation server. The prior art also fails to teach or suggest creating a link on the legacy server root corresponding to the legacy share on the new server.

The prior art also fails to teach or suggest resolving the legacy server name that is aliased to the consolidation server. The prior art also fails to teach or suggest receiving at the consolidation server a request from a client for the legacy share path name. The prior art also fails to teach or suggest the consolidation server rewriting the legacy share path name by prepending the legacy share path with the consolidation server's own name. The prior art also fails to teach or suggest the consolidation server traversing the rewritten legacy share path name and resolving links within the rewritten legacy share path name. The prior art also fails to teach or suggest the consolidation server responding to the client request with the share path name of the storage location of the relocated legacy share.

Because of at least the noted distinctions, a rejection of claims 23 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Krein, in view of Sebastine, and in view of Wallach would be improper and should be withdrawn. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of independent claims 23 and 36 (as well as the respective dependent claims).

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicants acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicants specifically request that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 23rd day of July, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN/JCJ/TMB:kjb
1916357_1